

18th October 1927]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am afraid it is passing the limits of putting supplementary questions, when a Member wants to contradict one statement of one of the Members of the Treasury Bench as against another statement in his official capacity. That is really assuming the role of debate, and I think such a process is not admissible in the case of supplementary questions."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I respectfully agree with you, Sir. But I am not referring to any speech made outside the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Even with regard to statements made in the House, I have come to the conclusion that it is cross-examination, and it is not permissible."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"May I ask the hon. the Minister for Excise which is the present opinion of the Government; is it the statement made on the budget debate, or the statement that the Government have not come to any decision on the question of prohibition? I want an answer to that, yes or no. Which is the correct statement of the policy of the Government on the matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I think the statement made in the budget debate is the correct statement, and I do not think I have said anything since to contradict that. I merely said that we have not come to any decision as to the exact methods."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"May I therefore ask, Sir, in view of his present answer, what his answer on the paper that no decision has yet been made on the question of prohibition means?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is again cross-examining."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"If you will allow me to make a statement, I am simply asking what that sentence in his answer means. I do not want to cross-examine him in any manner."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think it is permissible."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"May I know whether the reduction motion referred to has been given effect to; if so, how it has been given effect to, and what was the effect of the reduction?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"It is only Rs. 100 less money spent on the grant." (Laughter.)

Civil Justice

*Communal representation in the establishment of the Judicial department,
Guntur district.*

* 521 Q.—Mr. J. KUPPUSWAMI: Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact—

(i) that the non-Brahman (Hindu) proportion in the grades Rs. 180—10—240, Rs. 125—5—150, Rs. 80—4—120 and Rs. 60—4—80 in the Judicial department in Guntur district has fallen to nil;

[18th October 1927]

(ii) that out of 89 clerks in the grade Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60, there are only eight non-Brahmans and one Muhammadan ;

(iii) that the six vacancies that occurred in grade Rs. 60—4—80 from 1925 to the end of April 1927 were filled up by Brahman of whom two were suspended and one was debarred from promotion ;

(b) whether it is a fact that when the only non-Brahman head clerk in grade Rs. 60—4—80 retired from service, a Brahman clerk who was previously suspended for tampering with office records and whose suspension was approved by the High Court was appointed in his place in spite of the fact that there were qualified non-Brahmans available and that the non-Brahman proportion was falling to nil ;

(c) whether the Government have taken any steps to ascertain the causes for this disparity in the proportion ; and

(d) what steps the Government propose to take in the matter when the communal Government Orders are thus disregarded?

A.—(a) (i) The non-Brahman proportion in these grades in the last three years in the civil courts of the Guntur district is as shown in the statement^a appended hereto.

(ii) There are 81 clerks in the grade of Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60 and not 89 as stated in the question. Of the 81 clerks 9 are non-Brahmans and 1 is a Muhammadan.

(iii) Yes. The Government understand that of the six clerks promoted one was debarred from promotion in 1912 and two others were suspended in 1916 and 1919 respectively. These three clerks are reported to have been promoted to their present posts on the recommendation of the officers concerned, their subsequent work having been found satisfactory.

(b) Yes. But there was only one non-Brahman clerk in the district qualified for the head clerk's post and he was far junior to all the six clerks promoted to the higher grade. He originally belonged to the Kistna district and exchanged his place with a clerk of the Guntur district far junior to him on the distinct understanding that he should take the rank of that clerk in the Guntur district so that the claims of senior clerks in the district might not suffer. Notwithstanding this arrangement, he submitted an application to the High Court on occurrence of a vacancy in the senior clerk's post in the Guntur district, claiming preference on the ground of communal representation. The High Court, however, disapproved of the attempt of this clerk to go back on the condition on which he had accepted his appointment in the Guntur district.

(c) The Government have ascertained that there were 17 vacancies in the grade of Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60 since 1921 and that they were filled up as follows:—8 non-Brahmans, 1 Muhammadan and 8 Brahman.

(d) The Government do not consider that the orders referred to have been disregarded.

18th October 1927]

Amendment of the Court Fees Act.

* 522 Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state what steps the Government have taken or propose to take to reduce or modify the Court Fees Act, after the undertaking given in this behalf by the hon. the Law Member during his budget speech on 16th March 1927?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 386.

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—“ May I just ask when this Government expects to get the decision of the Government of India on the matter ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ I cannot say when the Government of India will reply.”

Appointment of District Munsifs.

* 523 Q.—Mr. J. A. DAVIS : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) how many of each of the following communities—Brahmans, Non-Brahmans, Hindus, Muhammadans, Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians—hold appointments in the Judicial Service of this Presidency in each of the grades of District Judge, Subordinate Judge and District Munsif;

(b) how many among the candidates selected last year by the Madras High Court for the post of District Munsif belonged to each of those communities; and

(c) how many of the applications received last year by the High Court for District Munsifs' appointments were from qualified Anglo-Indians?

A.—(a)—

| | | | | | Figures as they stood on 18th July 1927. | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|---|---------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | Bra mans. | Non-Brahmans. | Muham-madans. | Indian Christians. | Anglo-Indians. |
| <i>District Judges—</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Permanent | .. | .. | .. | .. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | .. |
| Acting | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 | .. | .. |
| <i>Sub-Judges—</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Permanent | .. | .. | .. | .. | 29 | 5 | .. | .. | 2 vacant. |
| Acting Sub-Judges whose lien on their permanent appointments as District Munsifs has been suspended. | | | | | 5 | 2 | 1 | . | .. |
| <i>District Munsifs—</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Permanent | .. | .. | .. | .. | 111 | 35 | 5 | 3 | .. |
| Acting | .. | .. | .. | .. | 31 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| (b)— | | | | | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

(c) Four out of 265 applications.